# Received

# AUG 1 9 2015

## Filing Window

# ORIGINAL FILED

			UNIGHNAL FILED
1	Lucas Novak (SBN 257484) LAW OFFICES OF LUCAS T. NOVAK	ζ.	OCT 1 4 2015
2	8335 W Sunset Blvd., Suite 217	_	
3	Los Angeles, CA 90069		LOS ANGELES
4	Telephone: (323) 337-9015 Email: lucas.nvk@gmail.com		SUPERIOR COURT
5	Attorney for Plaintiff, Isabel Ruggeri		
6	SUPERIOR COURT	OF THI	E STATE OF CALIFORNIA
7	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES		
8	TOK IIID C	001111	
9		,	GAGENO POSSZOOO
10	ISABEL RUGGERI, an individual,	)	CASE NO. BC583009
11	Plainti	iff,	FROPOSED CONSENT JUDGMENT
12	♥,	)	Judge: Hon, Rolf M. Treu
13	HARBOR FREIGHT TOOLS USA, IN corporation, CENTRAL PURCHASING	C., a )	Dept.: 58 Compl. Filed: May 26, 2015
14	a limited liability company, and DOES through 100, inclusive,	1 )	Unlimited Jurisdiction
15		idants.	Ommitted Jurisdiction
16	Deter	)	
17			
18			
19			
20	111		
21			
22			
23	///		
24	///		
25	///		
26	1///		
27	///		
28	111		
20	111		
			1
			1 Consent Judgment Regarding Ruggeri v. Harbor Freight Tools USA, Inc.

sf-3533639

### 1. RECITALS

#### 1.1 The Parties

This Consent Judgment is entered into by and between Plaintiff, Isabel Ruggeri ("Plaintiff") and Defendant, Harbor Freight Tools USA, Inc. ("Defendant"). Plaintiff and Defendant shall hereinafter collectively be referred to as the "Parties."

Plaintiff is a citizen of the state of California with an interest in protecting the environment, improving human health and the health of ecosystems, and supporting environmentally sound practices, which includes promoting awareness of exposure to toxic chemicals and reducing exposure to hazardous substances found in consumer products.

Defendant employs ten (10) or more employees and is a person in the course of doing business as the term is defined in California *Health & Safety Code* section 25249.6 et seq. ("Proposition 65").

### 1.2 Allegations

Plaintiff alleges that Defendant sold screwdrivers, including the Pittsburgh 7-in-1 screwdriver (Item 94955) (hereinafter, the "Products") in the State of California causing users in California to be exposed to hazardous levels of lead without providing "clear and reasonable warnings", in violation of Proposition 65. Lead is potentially subject to Proposition 65 warning requirements because it is listed as known to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm.

On October 20, 2014, a sixty-day notice of violation ("60-Day Notice"), along with a Certificate of Merit, was provided by Plaintiff to Defendant and various public enforcement agencies regarding the alleged violation of Proposition 65 with respect to the Products.

Plaintiff subsequently filed the instant action in the public interest in the Superior Court for the County of Los Angeles, alleging violations of Proposition 65 with respect to the Products.

### 1.3 No Admissions

Defendant denies all allegations in Plaintiff's 60-Day Notice and Complaint, and maintains that the Products have been, and are, in compliance with all laws, and that Defendant has not violated Proposition 65. This Consent Judgment shall not be construed as an admission of liability by Defendant but to the contrary as a compromise of claims that are expressly

contested and denied. However, nothing in this section shall affect the Parties' obligations, duties, and responsibilities under this Consent Judgment.

### 1.4 Jurisdiction And Venue

For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the Parties stipulate that the above-entitled Court has jurisdiction over Defendant as to the allegations of the Complaint and that venue is proper in Los Angeles County, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter and enforce the provisions of this Consent Judgment pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure ("CCP") § 664.6 and Proposition 65.

### 1.5 Effective Date

The "Effective Date" shall be the date upon which this Consent Judgment is approved by the Court.

## 2. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND REFORMULATION

### 2.1 Reformulation

As of the Effective Date, Defendant shall not sell or offer for sale in California the Products if they contain more than 100 parts per million of Lead in their handgrips and/or accessible surfaces when analyzed pursuant to Environmental Protection Agency testing methodologies 3050B or equivalent, unless a clear and reasonable Proposition 65 warning accompanies each unit, as described below.

### 2.2 Clear And Reasonable Warnings

(a) Retail Store Sales. For Products that are sold in retail stores located in California and do not meet the reformulation standard described in section 2.1 above, each unit not meeting said reformulation shall be accompanied by the following specific warning with the capitalized and emboldened wording:

"WARNING: This product contains a chemical known to the State of California to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm."

Each unit shall carry said warning directly on each unit or its label or package, near the product name, price, or UPC code, in a manner reasonably calculated to be seen by the ordinary consumer.

Californians via the internet and that do not meet the standard described in section 2.1, shall be accompanied by a Proposition 65 warning, either: (a) on the same web page on which a Product is displayed; (b) on the same web page as the order form for a Product; (c) on the same web page as the price for a Product prior to sales completion; (d) on one or more web pages displayed to a purchaser during the checkout process prior to sales completion; or (e) on a web page with a clearly marked hyperlink from the product display page. The warning shall contain language consistent with the following statement and shall appear in any of the above instances, in the same type size as the Product description text, in a sufficiently conspicuous manner reasonably calculated to be seen by the ordinary consumer of the Products:

"WARNING: This product contains a chemical known to the State of California to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm."

### 3. PAYMENTS

## 3.1 Civil Penalty Pursuant To Proposition 65

In settlement of all causes of action in Plaintiff's Complaint, Defendant shall pay a total civil penalty of three thousand dollars (\$3,000.00) to be apportioned in accordance with *Health* and Safety Code section 25249.12(c)(1) and (d), with 75% (\$2,250) paid to State of California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA"), and the remaining 25% (\$750.00) paid to Plaintiff.

Defendant shall issue two (2) checks for the civil penalty: (1) a check or money order made payable to "Law Offices of Lucas T. Novak in Trust for OEHHA" in the amount of \$2,250; and (2) a check or money order made payable to "Law Offices of Lucas T. Novak in Trust for Isabel Ruggeri" in the amount of \$750. Defendant shall remit the payments within five (5) business days of the Effective Date, to:

Lucas T. Novak, Esq. LAW OFFICES OF LUCAS T. NOVAK 8335 W Sunset Blvd., Suite 217 Los Angeles, CA 90069

## 3.2 Reimbursement Of Plaintiff's Fees And Costs

Defendant shall reimburse Plaintiff's reasonable experts' and attorney's fees and costs

incurred in prosecuting the instant action, for all work performed through execution of this agreement and approval of this Consent Judgment. Accordingly, Defendant shall issue a check or money order made payable to "Law Offices of Lucas T. Novak" in the amount of eighteen thousand dollars (\$18,000). Defendant shall remit the payment within fifteen (15) business days of the Effective Date, to:

Lucas T. Novak, Esq. LAW OFFICES OF LUCAS T. NOVAK 8335 W Sunset Blvd., Suite 217 Los Angeles, CA 90069

### 4. RELEASES

### 4.1 Plaintiff's Release Of Defendant

This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between Plaintiff and Defendant and each of its past and present parents, affiliates, subsidiaries, divisions, predecessors, successors, and assigns, and each of their respective owners, officers, directors, board members, trustees, shareholders, managers, members, employees, agents, insurers, attorneys, auditors, accountants, experts, stockholders, representatives, partners, and any other persons acting on its behalf ("Released Parties") concerning or in any way relating to the claims that have been or could have been asserted against Defendant and/or the Released Parties up through the date on which this Consent Judgment is entered, provided that such claims are based on or relate to the facts alleged in the operative complaint filed by Plaintiff in this action.

### 4.2 Defendant's Release Of Plaintiff

Defendant, the Released Parties, and on behalf of their downstream retailers, downstream distributors, and downstream wholesalers, by this Consent Judgment, waive all rights to institute any form of legal action against Plaintiff, her past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, experts, successors and assignees, for actions or statements made or undertaken, in connection with investigating claims or seeking enforcement of Proposition 65 against Defendant in this matter.

4.3 Plaintiff, acting on her own behalf and in the public interest pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(d), releases, waives, and forever discharges any and all claims against

Defendant and/or the Released Parties arising from any violation of Proposition 65 or any other statutory or common law claims that have been or could have been asserted in the public interest regarding the failure to warn about exposure to Lead arising in connection with the Products manufactured, distributed, and sold by Defendant prior to the date on which this Consent Judgment is entered.

- 4.4 Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment by Defendant and the Released Parties shall constitute compliance with Proposition 65 by Defendant and the Released Parties with respect to any alleged failure to warn about Lead in the Products manufactured, distributed, or sold by Defendant after the date on which this Consent Judgment is entered.
- 4.5 Modification. This Consent Judgment may be modified from time to time by express written agreement of the Parties, with the approval of the Court, or by an order of the Court upon motion and in accordance with law.
- 4.6 Notice; Meet and Confer. Any Party seeking to modify this Consent Judgment shall attempt in good faith to meet and confer with the other Party prior to filing a motion to modify the Consent Judgment.

#### 4.7 Waiver Of Unknown Claims

Each of the Parties acknowledges that it is familiar with Section 1542 of California Civil Code which provides as follows:

"A general release does not extend to claims which the creditor does not know or suspect to exist in his or her favor at the time of executing the release, which if known by him or her must have materially affected his or her settlement with the debtor."

Each of the Parties waives and relinquishes any right or benefit it has or may have under Section 1542 of California Civil Code or any similar provision under the statutory or non-statutory law of any other jurisdiction to the full extent that it may lawfully waive all such rights and benefits. The Parties acknowledge that each may subsequently discover facts in addition to, or different from, those that it believes to be true with respect to the claims released herein. The Parties agree that this Consent Judgment and the releases contained herein shall be and remain

effective in all respects notwithstanding the discovery of such additional or different facts.

### 5. COURT APPROVAL

Upon execution of this Consent Judgment by all Parties, Plaintiff shall file a noticed Motion for Approval and Entry of Consent Judgment in the above-entitled Court. This Consent Judgment is not effective until it is approved by the Court and shall be null and void if, for any reason, it is not approved by the Court within one (1) year after its full execution by all Parties. It is the intention of the Parties that the Court approve this Consent Judgment, and in furtherance of obtaining such approval, the Parties and their respective counsel agree to mutually employ their best efforts to support the entry of this Consent Judgment in a timely manner, including cooperating on drafting and filing any papers in support of the required motion for judicial approval.

### 6. SEVERABILITY

Subsequent to Court approval of this Consent Judgment, should any part or provision of this Consent Judgment, for any reason, be declared by a Court to be invalid, void or unenforceable, the remaining portions and provisions shall continue in full force and effect.

### 7. GOVERNING LAW

The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California.

### 8. NOTICES

All correspondence and notices required to be provided under this Consent Judgment shall be in writing and delivered personally or sent by first class or certified mail addressed as follows:

### TO DEFENDANT:

Peter Hsiao
PHsiao@mofo.com
Navi Dhillon
NDhillon@mofo.com
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

### TO PLAINTIFF:

Lucas T. Novak, Esq. LAW OFFICES OF LUCAS T. NOVAK 8335 W Sunset Blvd., Suite 217 Los Angeles, CA 90069

1 Tammy Stafford Associate General Counsel, Litigation and 2 Harbor Freight Tools USA, Inc. 3 26541 Agoura Road Calabasas, CA 91302 4 Email: TStafford@harborfreight.com 5 6 7

#### 9. **INTEGRATION**

This Consent Judgment constitutes the entire agreement between the parties with respect to the subject matter hereof and may not be amended or modified except in writing.

#### **COUNTERPARTS** 10.

This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, and all of which, when taken together, shall constitute the same document. Execution and delivery of this Consent Judgment by e-mail, facsimile, or other electronic means shall constitute legal and binding execution and delivery. Any photocopy of the executed Consent Judgment shall have the same force and effect as the originals.

#### **AUTHORIZATION** 11.

The undersigned are authorized to execute this Consent Judgment on behalf of their respective Parties. Each Party has read, understood, and agrees to all of the terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment. Each Party warrants to the other that it is free to enter into this Consent Judgment and not subject to any conflicting obligation that will or might prevent or interfere with the execution or performance of this Consent Judgment by said party.

III22

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

111 23

III24

III25

/// 26

/// 27 ///

28

ļ		
1		
2	AGREED TO:	
3	Date: 8/6/15	
4	1 1 _	
5	By: W k	
6	Authorized Officer of Defendant, I	Harbor Freight Tools USA, Inc.
7		
8	AGREED TO:	
9	Date:	<del></del>
10		
11	Ву:	<del></del>
12	Plaintiff, Isabel Ruggeri	
13		
14	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
15		
16	Dated:	
17		JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25 26		
20 27		
28		
20		
ļ		

1		
2	AGREED TO:	
3	Date:	
4		
5	By:	_
6	Authorized Officer of Defendant, Hard	bor Freight Tools USA, Inc.
7		
8	AGREED TO:	
9	Date: 7/22/15	
10		
11	By: I palul Kuggen	<u> </u>
12	Plaintiff, Isabel Ruggeri	
13		
14	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
15	2015	STEPHEN M. MOLONEY
16	Dated:	
17		JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		1
26		
27		
28		
		9 Consent Judgment Regarding Ruggeri v. Harbor
	sf-3533639	Freight Tools USA, Inc.
	11	